arXiv:math/0312491v1 [math.GR] 29 Dec 2003

NON-HOPFIAN RELATIVELY FREE GROUPS

S.V. IVANOV AND A.M. STOROZHEV

Abstract. To solve problems of Gilbert Baumslag and Hanna Neumann, posed in the 1960's, we construct a nontrivial variety of groups all of whose noncyclic free groups are non-hopfian.

1. Introduction

Recall that a group G is called *hopfian* if every epimorphism $G \to G$ is an automorphism. Let F_m be a free group of finite rank $m > 1$, N be a normal subgroup of F_m and $V(N)$ a verbal subgroup of N defined by a set of words V. In [2], Baumslag proved that if both quotients F_m/N, $N/V(N)$ are residually finite then the group $F_m/V(N)$ is also residually finite. In this connection, Baumslag [2] posed the following problem. Is $F_m/V(N)$ a hopfian group if the group F_m/N is hopfian? In particular, if $F_m = N$ then F_m/N is trivial and hopfian and so the Baumslag problem asks about the hopfian property of relatively free groups $F_m/V(F_m)$, where $V(F_m)$ is a verbal (or fully invariant) subgroup of F_m. The problem on the hopfian property of finitely generated relatively free groups was independently stated by H. Neumann [12, Problem 15]. Recall that a finitely generated residually finite group is hopfian (e.g., see Corollary 41.44 [12]). Hence, if one could show that relatively free groups are residually finite then H. Neumann's problem would be solved in the affirmative. However, this is not the case in general and it follows from Novikov–Adian results [13], [1] (see also [14], [16], [5], [11], [6]) on the Burnside problem for odd $n \geq 665$ and Kostrikin–Zelmanov results [8], [9], [19] on the restricted Burnside problem for $n = p^k$, where p is prime, that the free m-generator Burnside group $B(m, n) = F_m/F_m^n$ of exponent n is not residually finite if $m > 1$ and n is odd, $n = p^k > 665$ (in fact, $B(m, n)$ is not residually finite for all $m > 1$ and $n \gg 1$ as follows from results of [8], [9], [19], [20], [4], [13], [5] and the classification of finite simple groups). Whether the group $B(m, n)$ is hopfian (or, more generally, whether there is a hopfian non-residually finite relatively free group) is still unknown (the problem on the hopfian property of $B(m, n)$ for odd $n \gg 1$ is stated in [10, Problem 11.36(c)]).

In this article we construct a variety of groups of exponent 0 all of whose noncyclic free groups are non-hopfian providing thereby negative solutions to the foregoing problems of Baumslag and H. Neumann. To construct the identities that define such a variety of groups, we let $[a, b] = aba^{-1}b^{-1}$ be the commutator of a, b and set

$$v_0(x, y) = x, \quad v_1(x, y) = [((x^d y^d)^d x^d)^d, x^d]^d y, \quad v_2(x, y) = [v_1(x, y)^d, x^d]. \qquad (1)$$

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 20E10, 20F05, 20F06.

The first author is supported in part by NSF grant DMS 00-99612.

Now we define the words $w_1(x,y)$, $w_2(x,y)$ by following formulas

$$\begin{aligned} w_1(x,y) = x^{\varepsilon_1} v_1(x,y)^{n} x^{\varepsilon_2} v_1(x,y)^{n+2} \dots x^{\varepsilon_{h/2-2}} v_1(x,y)^{n+h-6} \\ x^{\varepsilon_{h/2-1}} v_1(x,y)^{n+h-4} x^{\varepsilon_{h/2}} v_1(x,y)^{(n+h-2)+h/2} x^{\varepsilon_1} v_1(x,y)^{-(n+1)} \\ x^{\varepsilon_2} v_1(x,y)^{-(n+3)} \dots x^{\varepsilon_{h/2-1}} v_1(x,y)^{-(n+h-3)} x^{\varepsilon_{h/2}} v_1(x,y)^{-(n+h-1)}, \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

$$\begin{aligned} w_2(x,y) = y v_2(x,y)^{n^2+1} v_1(x,y)^{\varepsilon_2} v_2(x,y)^{n^2+2} v_1(x,y)^{\varepsilon_3} v_2(x,y)^{n^2+3} \dots \\ \dots v_1(x,y)^{\varepsilon_{h-1}} v_2(x,y)^{n^2+h-1} v_1(x,y)^{\varepsilon_h} v_2(x,y)^{n^2+h}, \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

where $h \equiv 0 \pmod{20}$,

$$\varepsilon_{10k+1} = \varepsilon_{10k+2} = \varepsilon_{10k+3} = \varepsilon_{10k+5} = \varepsilon_{10k+6} = 1,$$
$$\varepsilon_{10k+4} = \varepsilon_{10k+7} = \varepsilon_{10k+8} = \varepsilon_{10k+9} = \varepsilon_{10k+10} = -1$$

for $k = 0, 1, \dots, h/10 - 1$, and h, d, n are sufficiently large positive integers (with $n \gg d \gg h \gg 1$). Note that the sums of exponents on x, y in both (2) and (3) are zeros.

Now we can state our main result (note that this result was announced in [7, Theorem 5]; for the sake of simplicity of proofs we changed the identities $w_1(x,y) \equiv 1$, $w_2(x,y) \equiv 1$ presented in [7]).

Theorem. *Let $\mathfrak{M}$ be the variety of groups defined by identities $w_1(x,y) \equiv 1$, $w_2(x,y) \equiv 1$, where the words $w_1(x,y)$, $w_2(x,y)$ are given by formulas (2), (3). Then any free group of rank $m > 1$ in the variety $\mathfrak{M}$ is not hopfian.*

To prove this Theorem, in Sect. 2, we inductively construct a group presentation by means of generators and defining relations. In Sect. 3, we apply the geometric machinery of graded diagrams, developed by Ol'shanskii [15], [16], to study subpresentations of this presentation and to prove a number of technical lemmas. In particular, we use the notation and terminology of [16] and all notions that are not defined in this paper can be found in [16]. In Sect. 4, we show that the group presentation constructed in Sect. 2 defines a free group of rank $m > 1$ in the variety $\mathfrak{M}$ and this group is non-hopfian.

2. Inductive Construction

As in [16], we will use numerical parameters

$$\alpha \succ \beta \succ \gamma \succ \delta \succ \varepsilon \succ \zeta \succ \eta \succ \iota$$

and $h = \delta^{-1}$, $d = \eta^{-1}$, $n = \iota^{-1}$ (h, d, n were already used in (2)–(3)) and employ the least parameter principle (LPP) (according to LPP a small positive value for, say, ζ is chosen to satisfy all inequalities whose smallest (in terms of the relation $\succ$) parameter is ζ).

Let $\mathcal{A} = \{a_1, \dots, a_m\}$ be an alphabet, $m > 1$, and $F(\mathcal{A})$ be the free group in $\mathcal{A}$. Elements of $F(\mathcal{A})$ are referred to as *words in* $\mathcal{A}^{\pm 1} = \mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}^{-1}$ or just words. Denote $G(0) = F(\mathcal{A})$ and let the set $\mathcal{R}_0$ be empty. To define the group $G(i)$ by induction on $i \geq 1$, assume that the group $G(i-1)$ is already constructed by its presentation

$$G(i-1) = \langle \mathcal{A} \parallel R = 1, R \in \mathcal{R}_{i-1} \rangle.$$

Let $\mathcal{X}_i$ be a set of words (in $\mathcal{A}^{\pm 1}$) of length i, called *periods of rank* i, which is maximal with respect to the following two properties:

(A1) If $A \in \mathcal{X}_i$ then A (that is, the image of A in $G(i-1)$) is not conjugate in $G(i-1)$ to a power of a word of length $< |A| = i$.

(A2) If A, B are distinct elements of $\mathcal{X}_i$ then A is not conjugate in $G(i-1)$ to B or B^{-1}.

If the images of two words X, Y are equal in the group $G(i-1)$, $i \geq 1$, then we will say that X is *equal in rank* $i-1$ to Y and will write $X \overset{i-1}{=} Y$. Analogously, we will say that two words X, Y are *conjugate in rank* $i-1$ if their images are conjugate in the group $G(i-1)$. As in [16], a word A is called *simple* in rank $i-1$, $i \geq 1$, if A is conjugate in rank $i-1$ neither to a power B^k, where $|B| < |A|$ nor to a power of period of some rank $\leq i-1$. We will also say that two pairs (X_1, X_2), (Y_1, Y_2) of words are conjugate in rank $i-1$, $i \geq 1$, if there is a word W such that $X_1 \overset{i-1}{=} WY_1W^{-1}$ and $X_2 \overset{i-1}{=} WY_2W^{-1}$.

Consider the set of all possible pairs (X, Y) of words in $\mathcal{A}^{\pm 1}$ and pick $z^* \in \{1, 2\}$. This set is partitioned by equivalence z^*-classes $\mathcal{C}_\ell(z^*)$, $\ell = 1, 2, \dots$, of the equivalence relation $\overset{z^*}{\sim}$ defined as follows: $(X_1, Y_1) \overset{z^*}{\sim} (X_2, Y_2)$ if and only if the pairs $(v_{z^*}(X_1, Y_1), w_{z^*}(X_1, Y_1))$ and $(v_{z^*}(X_2, Y_2), w_{z^*}(X_2, Y_2))$ are conjugate in rank $i-1$. It is convenient to enumerate (in some way)

$$\mathcal{C}_{A^f,1}(z^*), \mathcal{C}_{A^f,2}(z^*), \dots$$

all z^*-classes of pairs (X, Y) such that $w_{z^*}(X, Y) \overset{i-1}{\neq} 1$ and $v_{z^*}(X, Y)$ is conjugate in rank $i-1$ to some power A^f, where $A \in \mathcal{X}_i$ and f are fixed.

It follows from definitions that every class $\mathcal{C}_{A^f,j}(z^*)$ contains a pair

$$(X_{A^f,j,z^*}, \bar{Y}_{A^f,j,z^*})$$

with the following properties. The word X_{A^f,j,z^*} is graphically (that is, letter-by-letter) equal to a power of B_{A^f,j,z^*}, where B_{A^f,j,z^*} is simple in rank $i-1$ or a period of rank $\leq i-1$; $\bar{Y}_{A^f,j,z^*} \equiv Z_{A^f,j,z^*} Y_{A^f,j,z^*} Z^{-1}_{A^f,j,z^*}$, where the symbol ’$\equiv$’ means the graphical equality, Y_{A^f,j,z^*} is graphically equal to a power of C_{A^f,j,z^*}, where C_{A^f,j,z^*} is simple in rank $i-1$ or a period of rank $\leq i-1$. We can also assume that if $D_1 \in \{A, B_{A^f,j,z^*}, C_{A^f,j,z^*}\}$ is conjugate in rank $i-1$ to $D_2^{\pm 1}$, where $D_2 \in \{A, B_{A^f,j,z^*}, C_{A^f,j,z^*}\}$, then $D_1 \equiv D_2$. Finally, the word Z_{A^f,j,z^*} is picked for fixed X_{A^f,j,z^*}, Y_{A^f,j,z^*} so that the length $|Z_{A^f,j,z^*}|$ is minimal (and the pair $(X_{A^f,j,z^*}, Z_{A^f,j,z^*} Y_{A^f,j,z^*} Z^{-1}_{A^f,j,z^*})$ belongs to $\mathcal{C}_{A^f,j}(z^*)$). Similar to [15], [16], [17], the triple $(X_{A^f,j,z^*}, Y_{A^f,j,z^*}, Z_{A^f,j,z^*})$ is called an (A^f, j, z^*)-*triple* corresponding to the class $\mathcal{C}_{A^f,j}(z^*)$ (in rank $i-1$).

Now for every class $\mathcal{C}_{A^f,j}(z^*)$ we pick a corresponding (A^f, j, z^*)-triple

$$(X_{A^f,j,z^*}, Y_{A^f,j,z^*}, Z_{A^f,j,z^*})$$

in rank $i-1$ and construct a defining word R_{A^f,j,z^*} of rank i as follows. Pick a word W_{A^f,j,z^*} of minimal length so that

$$v_{z^*}(X_{A^f,j,z^*}, \bar{Y}_{A^f,j,z^*}) \overset{i-1}{=} W_{A^f,j,z^*} A^f W^{-1}_{A^f,j,z^*}.$$

Let T_{A^f,j,z^*}, U_{A^f,j,z^*} be words of minimal length such that

$$T_{A^f,j,z^*} \overset{i-1}{=} W^{-1}_{A^f,j,z^*} v_{z^*-1}(X_{A^f,j,z^*}, \bar{Y}_{A^f,j,z^*}) W_{A^f,j,z^*}$$

$$U_{A^f,j,z^*} \overset{i-1}{=} W^{-1}_{A^f,j,z^*} \bar{Y}_{A^f,j,z^*} W_{A^f,j,z^*}$$

(recall that $v_0(x,y) = x$, see (1)).

If $z^* = 1$ then, in accordance with (2), we set

$$\begin{aligned} R_{A^f,j,1} = {} & T^{\varepsilon_1}_{A^f,j,1} A^{nf} T^{\varepsilon_2}_{A^f,j,1} A^{(n+2)f} \dots T^{\varepsilon_{h/2-2}}_{A^f,j,1} A^{(n+h-6)f} T^{\varepsilon_{h/2-1}}_{A^f,j,1} A^{(n+h-4)f} \\ & T^{\varepsilon_{h/2}}_{A^f,j,1} A^{(n+h-2+h/2)f} T^{\varepsilon_1}_{A^f,j,1} A^{-(n+1)f} T^{\varepsilon_2}_{A^f,j,1} A^{-(n+3)f} \dots \\ & \dots T^{\varepsilon_{h/2-1}}_{A^f,j,1} A^{-(n+h-3)f} T^{\varepsilon_{h/2}}_{A^f,j,1} A^{-(n+h-1)f}, \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where $\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_{h/2}$, h, n are defined as in (2).

If $z^* = 2$ then, in accordance with (3), we put

$$\begin{aligned} R_{A^f,j,2} = {} & U_{A^f,j,2} A^{(n^2+1)f} T^{\varepsilon_2}_{A^f,j,2} A^{(n^2+2)f} T^{\varepsilon_3}_{A^f,j,2} A^{(n^2+3)f} \dots \\ & \dots T^{\varepsilon_{h-1}}_{A^f,j,2} A^{(n^2+h-1)f} T^{\varepsilon_h}_{A^f,j,2} A^{(n^2+h)f}, \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

where $\varepsilon_2, \dots, \varepsilon_h$, h, n are defined as in (3).

It follows from definitions that the word R_{A^f,j,z^*} is conjugate in rank $i-1$ (by the word $W^{-1}_{A^f,j,z^*}$) to $w_{z^*}(X_{A^f,j,z^*}, \bar{Y}_{A^f,j,z^*}) \overset{i-1}{\neq} 1$.

The set $\mathcal{S}_i$ of defining words of rank i consists of all possible words R_{A^f,j,z^*} given by (4)–(5) (over all equivalence classes $\mathcal{C}_{A^f,j}(z^*)$, $A \in \mathcal{X}_i$). Finally, we put $\mathcal{R}_i = \mathcal{R}_{i-1} \cup \mathcal{S}_i$ and set

$$G(i) = \langle \mathcal{A} \parallel R = 1, R \in \mathcal{R}_i \rangle. \tag{6}$$

The inductive definition of groups $G(i)$, $i \geq 0$, is now complete and we can consider the limit group $G(\infty)$ given by defining words of all ranks $j = 1, 2, \dots$

$$G(\infty) = \langle \mathcal{A} \parallel R = 1, R \in \cup_{j=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{R}_j \rangle. \tag{7}$$

3. Several Lemmas

We will prove (Lemma 13) that the group $G(\infty)$, defined by (7), is the free group of the variety $\mathfrak{M}$ in the alphabet $\mathcal{A}$, that is, $G(\infty)$ is naturally isomorphic to the quotient $F(\mathcal{A})/W_{1,2}(F(\mathcal{A}))$, where $W_{1,2}(F(\mathcal{A}))$ is the verbal subgroup of $F(\mathcal{A})$, defined by the set $W_{1,2} = \{w_1(x,y), w_2(x,y)\}$. We will also show that $G(\infty)$ is not hopfian (Lemma 14). But first we need to study the presentation (6) of $G(i)$ and establish a number of technical lemmas.

As in Sects. 29–30 [16], the following Lemmas 1–12 are proved by induction on $i \geq 0$ (whose base for $i = 0$ is trivial).

Lemma 1. *The presentation* (6) *of* $G(i)$ *satisfies the condition* R *of* [16, Sect. 25].

Proof. This proof is quite similar to the proof of Lemma 29.4 [16]. Inductive references to Lemmas 30.3, 30.4, 30.5 [16] (in rank $i-1$) are replaced by references to Lemma 9. Note that, by Lemma 9, we have that

$$n^2 > 100\zeta^{-1}(n+h) \geq |f|(n+h)$$

(LPP: $\delta = h^{-1} \succ \zeta \succ \iota = n^{-1}$) which implies that, repeating the arguments of Lemma 29.3 [16], we can conclude that the defining relators R, R' correspond to the same value of z^*. Therefore, Lemma 12 enables us to finish the proof of the analog of Lemma 29.3 as in [16] (note that we need Lemma 12 only when $z^* = 2$). $\square$

Lemma 2. *Suppose that* X_1, X_2 *are some words and* $k \neq 0$ *is an integer. Then*

(*a*) *If* $[X_1^k, X_2^k] \overset{i}{=} 1$, *then* $[X_1, X_2] \overset{i}{=} 1$;

(*b*) *If* $X_1^k \overset{i}{=} X_2^k$, *then* $X_1 \overset{i}{=} X_2$. *In particular, the group* $G(i)$, *defined by* (*6*), *is torsion-free.*

Proof. (a) It follows from definitions and Lemma 25.2 [16] that the group $G(i)$, defined by (6), is torsion-free. Hence, we can apply Lemma 25.12 [16] to equality $[X_1^k, X_2^k] \overset{i}{=} 1$ and obtain that $[X_1, X_2] \overset{i}{=} 1$, as required.

(b) The equality $X_1^k \overset{i}{=} X_2^k$ implies that $[X_1^k, X_2^k] \overset{i}{=} 1$ and, by part (a), we have $[X_1, X_2] \overset{i}{=} 1$. Hence, $(X_1 X_2^{-1})^k \overset{i}{=} 1$ and, as above, it follows from definitions and Lemma 25.2 [16] that $X_1 X_2^{-1} \overset{i}{=} 1$. Lemma 2 is proved. $\square$

Recall that a subgroup H of a group G is called *antinormal* if for every $g \in G$ the inequality $gHg^{-1} \cap H \neq \{1\}$ implies that $g \in H$.

Lemma 3. (*a*) *Every word is conjugate in rank i to a power of either a simple in rank i word or a period of rank* $\le i$.

(*b*) *Suppose that each of* A, B *is either a simple in rank i word or a period of rank* $\le i$ *and* A^k *is conjugate in rank i to* B^ℓ, $\ell \neq 0$. *Then* A *is conjugate in rank i to* B *or to* B^{-1}.

(*c*) *Let* A *be a simple in rank i word or a period of rank* $\le i$. *Then the cyclic subgroup* $\langle A \rangle$, *generated by* A, *of the group* $G(i)$, *defined by* (*6*), *is antinormal.*

Proof. Part (a) follows from definitions (see also Lemma 18.1 [16]). Since the group $G(i)$ is torsion-free by Lemma 2, we can argue as in the proof of Lemma 25.17 [16] (see also the proof of Theorem 19.4 [16]) to prove part (b) and obtain that an equality of the form $ZA^kZ^{-1} \overset{i}{=} A^\ell$, $\ell \neq 0$, implies that $Z \in \langle A \rangle$, as required in part (c). Lemma 3 is proved. $\square$

In addition to A-, B-, …, H-maps which are introduced and investigated in [16], we will need I-maps (cf. [17]) defined as follows. A B-map Δ is called an *I-map* if following properties (I1)–(I5) hold.

(I1) Δ is a map on a sphere punctured at least once and at most thrice.

(I2) The cyclic sections of the boundary $\partial\Delta$ of Δ are products of sections (some of which or all can be cyclic) of two types: long sections and short sections.

(I3) If s is a long section of $\partial\Delta$ then s is smooth of rank $r(s)$ and $|s| > 10\zeta^{-1} r(s)$.

(I4) If t is a short section of $\partial\Delta$ then $|t| < \zeta|s_0|$, where s_0 is a long section of minimal length.

(I5) If $L(\partial\Delta)$ and $S(\partial\Delta)$ are the numbers of long and short sections of $\partial\Delta$, respectively, then $S(\partial\Delta) \le 2L(\partial\Delta)$ and $1 \le L(\partial\Delta) \le 10$.

Lemma 4. *Suppose that* Δ *is an I-map. Then there is a system of pairwise disjoint regular contiguity submaps of long sections to long sections in* Δ *such that no two distinct contiguity submaps of a long section* s_1 *to a long section* s_2 *are contained in any larger contiguity submap of* s_1 *to* s_2 *and the sum of contiguity arcs of contiguity submaps of the system is greater than* $(1 - \alpha^{1/4})L_s$, *where* L_s *is the sum of lengths of all long sections of* $\partial\Delta$.

Proof. Without loss of generality, we can assume that every short section t of $\partial\Delta$ is geodesic in Δ (and that if t is cyclic then t is cyclically geodesic; note that we can always replace t by a homotopic to t in Δ geodesic path).

This proof is analogous to the proof of Lemma 24.6 [16] (see also Lemmas 23.15, 24.2 [16] on C- and D-maps). Repeating arguments of the proof of Lemma 24.6 [16], we can establish similar estimates for an I-map Δ. Note that we need to make straightforward corrections of the number of distinguished contiguity submaps between p and q, where p, q are sections of $\partial\Delta$ or $\partial\Pi$ and Π is a 2-cell of Δ, and of the number of distinguished contiguity submaps between sections of $\partial\Delta$. As in the proof of Lemma 24.6 [16], we obtain the estimate $M < \alpha\nu(\Delta)$, where M is the sum of weights of all inner edges of Δ and $\nu(\Delta)$ is the total weight of Δ.

Now we can argue as in the proof of Lemma 23.15 [16] to derive that the sum of lengths of outer arcs of long sections of $\partial\Delta$ is greater than $(1-\alpha^{1/4})L_s$. □

Lemma 5. *Suppose that each of A_1, A_2, B is a simple in rank i word or a period of rank $\le i$, $[A_1^{k_1}, ZA_2^{k_2}Z^{-1}] \overset{i}{\neq} 1$ for some word Z, and B^ℓ is conjugate in rank i either to $[A_1^{dk_1}, ZA_2^{dk_2}Z^{-1}]$ or to $A_1^{dk_1}ZA_2^{dk_2}Z^{-1}$. Then $0 < |\ell| \le 100\zeta^{-1}$ and either $\max(|A_1^{dk_1}|, |A_2^{dk_2}|) \le \zeta^{-1}|B^\ell|$ if B^ℓ is conjugate in rank i to $[A_1^{dk_1}, ZA_2^{dk_2}Z^{-1}]$ or $\max(|A_1^{dk_1}|, |A_2^{dk_2}|) \le \zeta^{-2}|B^\ell|$ if B^ℓ is conjugate in rank i to $A_1^{dk_1}ZA_2^{dk_2}Z^{-1}$.*

Proof. Without loss of generality (see also Lemma 3), we can assume that if $B_1 \in \{A_1^{\pm1}, A_2^{\pm1}, B^{\pm1}\}$ is conjugate in rank i to $B_2 \in \{A_1^{\pm1}, A_2^{\pm1}, B^{\pm1}\}$, then $B_1 \equiv B_2$.

If $\ell = 0$, that is, either $[A_1^{dk_1}, ZA_2^{dk_2}Z^{-1}] \overset{i}{=} 1$ or $A_1^{dk_1}ZA_2^{dk_2}Z^{-1} \overset{i}{=} 1$ then, by Lemma 2, we have that either $[A_1^{k_1}, ZA_2^{k_2}Z^{-1}] \overset{i}{=} 1$ or $A_1^{k_1}ZA_2^{k_2}Z^{-1} \overset{i}{=} 1$, contrary to lemma's hypothesis $[A_1^{k_1}, ZA_2^{k_2}Z^{-1}] \overset{i}{\neq} 1$. Hence, $\ell \neq 0$.

First assume that

$$[A_1^{dk_1}, ZA_2^{dk_2}Z^{-1}] \overset{i}{=} W_B B^\ell W_B^{-1} \tag{8}$$

for some word W_B. Then there is a reduced diagram Δ_1 of rank i on a thrice punctured sphere the labels of 3 cyclic sections of whose boundary $\partial\Delta_1$ are $A_1^{dk_1}$, $A_1^{-dk_1}$, B^ℓ (Δ_1 can be constructed from a simply connected diagram Δ_0 of rank i for equality (8) by identifying sections of $\partial\Delta_0$ labelled by $ZA_2^{dk_2}Z^{-1}$ and $ZA_2^{-dk_2}Z^{-1}$, W_B and W_B^{-1}). If $|\ell| > 100\zeta^{-1}$, then Δ_1 is a G-map (see [16, Sect. 24.2]) and, as in the proof of 25.19 [16], it follows from Lemma 24.8 [16] that $B^\ell \overset{i}{=} 1$, contrary to Lemma 2 and $\ell \neq 0$. Hence, $|\ell| \le 100\zeta^{-1}$, as desired.

Suppose that $|B^\ell| < \zeta|A_1^{dk_1}|$. Then Δ_1 is an E-map (see [16, Sect. 24.2]) and it follows from Lemmas 24.6, 25.10 [16] that cyclic sections of $\partial\Delta_1$, labelled by $A_1^{dk_1}$, $A_1^{-dk_1}$, are A_1-compatible. Now it is easy to see that $B^\ell \overset{i}{=} 1$, whence $\ell = 0$ by Lemma 2. This contradiction to $\ell \neq 0$ shows that $|A_1^{dk_1}| \le \zeta^{-1}|B^\ell|$, as desired. Analogously, $|A_2^{dk_2}| \le \zeta^{-1}|B^\ell|$ (using equality (8), we can construct a similar diagram Δ_2 the labels of 3 cyclic sections of whose boundary $\partial\Delta_2$ are $A_2^{dk_2}$, $A_2^{-dk_2}$, B^ℓ, and then argue as before).

Now assume that

$$A_1^{dk_1}ZA_2^{dk_2}Z^{-1} \overset{i}{=} W_B B^\ell W_B^{-1} \tag{9}$$

for some word W_B. Then there is a reduced diagram Δ of rank i on a thrice punctured sphere the labels of 3 cyclic sections of whose boundary $\partial\Delta$ are $A_1^{dk_1}$, $A_2^{dk_2}$, $B^{-\ell}$ (Δ can be constructed from a simply connected diagram Δ_0 of rank i for equality (9) by identifying the sections of $\partial\Delta_0$ labelled by Z and Z^{-1}, W_B and W_B^{-1}). If $|\ell| > 100\zeta^{-1}$, then Δ is a G-map and, using Lemmas 24.8, 25.10 [16], we can conclude that one of cyclic sections of $\partial\Delta$ is compatible with another cyclic section of $\partial\Delta$. Then it follows from Lemmas 3 and 24.9 [16] that $[A_1^{dk_1}, ZA_2^{dk_2}Z^{-1}] \overset{i}{=} 1$ and so, by Lemma 2, $[A_1^{k_1}, ZA_2^{k_2}Z^{-1}] \overset{i}{=} 1$, contrary to lemma's hypothesis. This contradiction shows that $|\ell| \le 100\zeta^{-1}$.

Suppose that $|B^\ell| < \zeta \min(|A_1^{dk_1}|, |A_2^{dk_2}|)$. Then Δ is an E-map (see [16, Sect. 24.2]) and, it follows from Lemmas 24.6, 25.10 [16] that two distinct cyclic sections of $\partial\Delta$ are compatible. As above, this implies that $[A_1^{k_1}, ZA_2^{k_2}Z^{-1}] \overset{i}{=} 1$, contrary to lemma's hypothesis. Hence, it is shown that $|B^\ell| \ge \zeta \min(|A_1^{dk_1}|, |A_2^{dk_2}|)$. For definiteness, let $|A_1^{dk_1}| \le |A_2^{dk_2}|$. Then

$$\zeta|A_1^{dk_1}| \le |B^\ell|. \tag{10}$$

If $|A_2^{dk_2}| \le \zeta^{-2}|B^\ell|$ then our proof is obviously finished. So we may assume that

$$|A_2^{dk_2}| > \zeta^{-2}|B^\ell|. \tag{11}$$

It follows from inequalities (10)–(11) that $|A_1^{dk_1}|, |B^\ell| < \zeta|A_2^{dk_2}|$ and we can see that Δ is an I-map. This, however, is impossible by Lemmas 4 and 25.10 [16]. This contradiction completes the proof of Lemma 5. ☐

Now suppose that X, Y are some words and

$$[X, Y] \overset{i}{\neq} 1. \tag{12}$$

Conjugating the pair (X, Y) in rank i if necessary, we can assume that $X \equiv B^{k_B}$, $Y \equiv ZC^{k_C}Z^{-1}$, where each of B, C is either simple in rank i or a period of some rank $\le i$ and, when B^{k_B}, C^{k_C} are fixed, the word Z is picked to have minimal length. Furthermore, consider the following equalities

$$X^dY^d \overset{i}{=} W_D D^{k_D} W_D^{-1}, \qquad (X^dY^d)^d X^d \overset{i}{=} W_E E^{k_E} W_E^{-1},$$
$$[((X^dY^d)^dX^d)^d, X^d] \overset{i}{=} W_F F^{k_F} W_F^{-1}, \quad [((X^dY^d)^dX^d)^d, X^d]^dY \overset{i}{=} W_G G^{k_G} W_G^{-1},$$
$$[([((X^dY^d)^dX^d)^d, X^d]^dY)^d, X^d] \overset{i}{=} W_H H^{k_H} W_H^{-1},$$

where each of D, E, F, G, H is either simple in rank i or a period of some rank $\le i$ and the conjugating words W_D, W_E, W_F, W_G, W_H are picked (when D, E, F, G, H are fixed) to have minimal length.

Without loss of generality, we can also assume that if $A_1 \in \{B, C, D, E, F, G, H\}$ is conjugate in rank i to $A_2^{\pm 1}$, where $A_2 \in \{B, C, D, E, F, G, H\}$, then $A_1 \equiv A_2$.

Lemma 6. *In the foregoing notation, the following estimates hold*

$$0 < |k_D| \le 100\zeta^{-1}, \quad \max(|B^{dk_B}|, |C^{dk_C}|) \le \zeta^{-2}|D^{k_D}|, \tag{13}$$
$$|Z| < 3\zeta^{-2}|D^{k_D}|, \quad |W_D| < 5\zeta^{-2}|D^{k_D}|, \tag{14}$$
$$0 < |k_E| \le 100\zeta^{-1}, \quad |D^{dk_D}| \le \zeta^{-2}|E^{k_E}|, \tag{15}$$
$$|W_E| < 2\zeta^{-2}|E^{k_E}|, \tag{16}$$
$$0 < |k_F| \le 100\zeta^{-1}, \quad |E^{dk_E}| \le \zeta^{-1}|F^{k_F}|, \tag{17}$$
$$|W_F| < 2\zeta^{-1}|F^{k_F}|. \tag{18}$$

Proof. If $k_D = 0$, that is, $X^dY^d \overset{i}{=} 1$, then, by Lemma 2, $XY \overset{i}{=} 1$ and, therefore, $[X, Y] \overset{i}{=} 1$, contrary to inequality (12). Hence $k_D \neq 0$.

In view of inequality (12), we can apply Lemma 5 to the pair $X \equiv B^{k_B}$, $Y \equiv ZC^{k_C}Z^{-1}$ which yields that $|k_D| \le 100\zeta^{-1}$ and $|B^{dk_B}|, |C^{dk_C}| \le \zeta^{-2}|D^{k_D}|$. Inequalities (13) are proved.

In view of equality $B^{dk_B}ZC^{dk_C}Z^{-1} \overset{i}{=} W_D D^{k_D} W_D^{-1}$, there is a reduced diagram Δ of rank i on a thrice punctured sphere the labels of three cyclic sections of whose boundary $\partial\Delta$ are B^{dk_B}, C^{dk_C}, D^{-k_D}. It follows from Lemmas 22.2, 24.9 [16] that

$$|Z| < (1+4\gamma)(|B^{dk_B}| + |C^{dk_C}| + |D^{k_D}|).$$

In view of inequalities (13), we have

$$|Z| < (1+4\gamma)(2\zeta^{-2}+1)|D^{k_D}| < 3\zeta^{-2}|D^{k_D}|,$$

as claimed in (14).

By estimates (13) and already proven inequality $|Z| < 3\zeta^{-2}|D^{k_D}|$, we have

$$|X^dY^d| = |B^{dk_B}| + |C^{dk_C}| + 2|Z| < 8\zeta^{-2}|D^{k_D}|.$$

Hence, it follows from Lemmas 1 and 22.1 [16] that

$$|W_D| < (\gamma + \tfrac{1}{2})(|X^dY^d| + |D^{k_D}|) < 5\zeta^{-2}|D^{k_D}|$$

and inequalities (14) are proved.

Now assume that $k_E = 0$. Then $(X^dY^d)^dX^d \overset{i}{=} 1$ which implies that

$$[(X^dY^d)^d, X^d] \overset{i}{=} 1.$$

Hence, by Lemma 2, we have $[X,Y] \overset{i}{=} 1$, contrary to inequality (12).

Consider the equality

$$W_D D^{dk_D} W_D^{-1} B^{dk_B} \overset{i}{=} W_E E^{k_E} W_E^{-1}. \tag{19}$$

In view of (13),

$$|B|, |C| \le d^{-1}\zeta^{-2}|D^{k_D}| \le d^{-1}\zeta^{-2}\cdot 100\zeta^{-1}|D|$$

and so $|B|, |C| < |D|$ (LPP: $\zeta \succ \eta = d^{-1}$). Hence, $[W_D D^{dk_D} W_D^{-1}, B^{dk_B}] \overset{i}{\neq} 1$ (otherwise, we would have a contradiction to Lemma 3). This last inequality enables us to apply Lemma 5 to equality (19) and conclude that $|k_E| \le 100\zeta^{-1}$, $|D^{dk_D}| \le \zeta^{-2}|E^{k_E}|$. Inequalities (15) are proved.

By (13), (14), (15), we obtain

$$|W_D D^{dk_D} W_D^{-1} B^{dk_B}| < (1 + 11\zeta^{-2}d^{-1})|D^{dk_D}| < 2\zeta^{-2}|E^{k_E}|$$

(LPP: $\zeta \succ \eta = d^{-1}$). Therefore, it follows from Lemmas 1 and 22.1 [16] that

$$|W_E| < (\gamma + \tfrac{1}{2})(|W_D D^{dk_D} W_D^{-1} B^{dk_B}| + |E^{k_E}|) < 2\zeta^{-2}|E^{k_E}|$$

as claimed in (16).

Next assume that $k_F = 0$. Then $[((X^dY^d)^dX^d)^d, X^d] \overset{i}{=} 1$. Hence, by Lemma 2, we obtain $[X,Y] \overset{i}{=} 1$, which contradicts inequality (12).

Now consider the equality $[W_E E^{dk_E} W_E^{-1}, B^{dk_B}] \overset{i}{=} W_F F^{k_F} W_F^{-1}$. By Lemma 5, $|k_F| \le 100\zeta^{-1}$, $|E^{dk_E}| \le \zeta^{-1}|F^{k_F}|$, and estimates (17) are proved.

In view of equality $[W_E E^{dk_E} W_E^{-1}, B^{dk_B}] \overset{i}{=} W_F F^{k_F} W_F^{-1}$, it follows from Lemma 22.1 [16] that

$$|W_F| < (\gamma + \tfrac{1}{2})\cdot 2(2|W_E| + |E^{dk_E}| + |B^{dk_B}| + \tfrac{1}{2}|F^{k_F}|).$$

Hence, by estimates (13), (15), (16), (17), we get

$$|W_F| < (1+2\gamma)((2\zeta^{-2}d^{-1}+1)|E^{dk_E}| + \zeta^{-4}d^{-2}|E^{dk_E}| + \tfrac{1}{2}|F^{k_F}|) <$$
$$< (1+2\gamma)(((2\zeta^{-2}d^{-1}+1)+\zeta^{-4}d^{-2})\zeta^{-1}+\tfrac{1}{2})|F^{k_F}|) < 2\zeta^{-1}|F^{k_F}|$$

(LPP: $\gamma \succ \zeta \succ \eta = d^{-1}$), as required. Lemma 6 is proved. □

Lemma 7. *In the foregoing notation, the following inequalities hold*

$$0 < |k_G| \le 10\zeta^{-1}, \tag{20}$$
$$|F^{dk_F}| \le \zeta^{-1}|G^{k_G}|, \tag{21}$$
$$|W_G| < \zeta^{-1}|G^{k_G}|. \tag{22}$$

Proof. If $k_G = 0$ then $[((X^dY^d)^dX^d)^d, X^d]^dY \overset{i}{=} 1$ which implies that F^{dk_F} is conjugate in rank i to C^{-k_C}. It follows from definitions and Lemma 3 that $F \equiv C$. However, it follows from Lemma 6 that

$$|C| \le \zeta^{-5}d^{-3}|F^{k_F}| \le 100\zeta^{-6}d^{-3}|F| < |F| \tag{23}$$

(LPP: $\zeta \succ \eta = d^{-1}$). Hence $k_G \neq 0$.

By definitions, we have

$$W_FF^{dk_F}W_F^{-1}ZC^{k_C}Z^{-1} \overset{i}{=} W_GG^{k_G}W_G^{-1}. \tag{24}$$

By Lemma 6,

$$|W_F^{-1}ZC^{k_C}Z^{-1}W_F| < (4\zeta^{-1}+6\zeta^{-5}d^{-2}+\zeta^{-5}d^{-3})|F^{k_F}| <$$
$$< 5\zeta^{-1}d^{-1}|F^{dk_F}| < \zeta|F^{dk_F}| \tag{25}$$

(LPP: $\zeta \succ \eta = d^{-1}$).

If $|G^{k_G}| < \zeta|F^{dk_F}|$ then a reduced annular diagram of rank i for conjugacy of words $F^{dk_F}W_F^{-1}ZC^{k_C}Z^{-1}W_F$ and G^{k_G} (see (24)) is an F-map (see Sect. 24.2 [16]) whose existence contradicts Lemma 1 and Lemmas 24.7, 25.10 [16]. Therefore, $|G^{k_G}| \ge \zeta|F^{dk_F}|$ and (21) is proved.

In view of equality (24), there is a reduced diagram Δ of rank i on a thrice punctured sphere the labels of whose cyclic sections are F^{dk_F}, C^{k_C}, G^{-k_G}. It follows from Lemma 6 that

$$|C^{k_C}| < \zeta^{-5}d^{-4}|F^{dk_F}| < \zeta^2|F^{dk_F}|$$

(LPP: $\zeta \succ \eta = d^{-1}$). Hence, by (21), $|C^{k_C}| < \zeta\min(|F^{dk_F}|, |G^{k_G}|)$. If $|k_G| > 10\zeta^{-1}$, then Δ is an E-map (see Sect. 24.2 [16]) and we can argue as in the proof of Lemma 25.19 [16] to show that $F \equiv G$ and the cyclic sections of Δ labelled by F^{dk_F}, G^{-k_E} are F-compatible. Then C^{k_C} is conjugate in rank i to a power of F. This, however, is impossible by Lemma 3 and inequality (23). Hence, $|k_G| \le 10\zeta^{-1}$ and inequalities (20) are proved.

By Lemma 1, we can apply Lemma 22.1 [16] to a reduced annular diagram of rank i for conjugacy of words $W_FF^{dk_F}W_F^{-1}ZC^{k_C}Z^{-1}$ and G^{k_G} to obtain, using estimates (21), (25), that

$$|W_G| < (\gamma+\tfrac{1}{2})(\zeta+1)(|F^{dk_F}|+|G^{k_G}|) \le (\gamma+\tfrac{1}{2})(\zeta+1)(\zeta^{-1}+1)|G^{k_G}| < \zeta^{-1}|G^{k_G}|,$$

as claimed in (22). Lemma 7 is proved. □

Lemma 8. *In the foregoing notation, the following inequalities hold*

$$0 < |k_H| \le 100\zeta^{-1}, \quad |G^{dk_G}| \le \zeta^{-1}|H^{k_H}|, \tag{26}$$

$$|W_H| < 2\zeta^{-1}|H^{k_H}|. \tag{27}$$

Proof. Assume that $[(([((X^dY^d)^dX^d)^d, X^d]^dY)^d, X^d] \overset{i}{=} 1$. Then, by Lemma 2, we also have $[[((X^dY^d)^dX^d)^d, X^d]^dY, X] \overset{i}{=} 1$. Since $X \equiv B^{k_B}$, it follows from Lemma 3 that $[((X^dY^d)^dX^d)^d, X^d]^dY \overset{i}{=} B^\ell$ for some ℓ and so G^{k_G} is conjugate in rank i to B^ℓ. By Lemmas 6 and 7,

$$|B^{k_B}| \le \zeta^{-5}d^{-3}|F^{k_F}| \le \zeta^{-6}d^{-4}|G^{k_G}| \le 10\zeta^{-7}d^{-4}|G| < |G|$$

(LPP: $\zeta \succ \eta = d^{-1}$), whence $|B| < |G|$. This, however, contradicts Lemma 3. Hence, $[(([((X^dY^d)^dX^d)^d, X^d]^dY)^d, X^d] \overset{i}{\ne} 1$ and so $k_H \ne 0$.

By definitions, $[W_GG^{dk_G}W_G^{-1}, B^{dk_B}] \overset{i}{=} W_HH^{k_H}W_H^{-1}$. By Lemma 5, $|k_H| \le 100\zeta^{-1}$, $|G^{dk_G}| \le \zeta^{-1}|H^{k_H}|$ and estimates (26) are proved.

As in proofs of Lemmas 6, 7, we have from Lemmas 1 and 22.1 [16] that

$$|W_H| < (\gamma + \tfrac{1}{2}) \cdot 2(2|W_G| + |G^{dk_G}| + |B^{dk_B}| + \tfrac{1}{2}|H^{k_H}|).$$

Hence, by Lemmas 6, 7 and estimates (26),

$$|W_H| < (1+2\gamma)((2\zeta^{-1}d^{-1}+1)|G^{dk_G}| + \zeta^{-6}d^{-4}|G^{dk_G}| + \tfrac{1}{2}|H^{k_H}|) <$$
$$< (1+2\gamma)((2\zeta^{-1}d^{-1} + 1 + \zeta^{-6}d^{-4})\zeta^{-1} + \tfrac{1}{2})|H^{k_H}| < 2\zeta^{-1}|H^{k_H}|$$

(LPP: $\gamma \succ \zeta \succ \eta = d^{-1}$), as required in (27). Lemma 8 is proved. □

Lemma 9. *Let R_{A^f,j,z^*} be a defining word of rank $i+1$ defined by (4) if $z^* = 1$ or by (5) if $z^* = 2$. Then $0 < |f| \le 100\zeta^{-1}$, $|A| > d$, the words T_{A^f,j,z^*}, U_{A^f,j,z^*} do not belong to the cyclic subgroup $\langle A\rangle$, generated by A, of $G(i)$ and*

$$\max(|T_{A^f,j,z^*}|, |U_{A^f,j,z^*}|) < d|A|.$$

Proof. First we let $z^* = 1$. It follows from definitions that, in the foregoing notation, we can assume that

$$A \equiv G, \quad T_{A^f,j,1} \overset{i}{=} W_G^{-1}B^{k_B}W_G, \quad U_{A^f,j,1} \overset{i}{=} W_G^{-1}ZC^{k_C}Z^{-1}W_G,$$

and $f = f(A^f, j, 1)$ is k_G. Hence, in view of Lemmas 6, 7,

$$0 < |f| \le 100\zeta^{-1},$$

$$|A| \ge 10^{-1}\zeta^2|F^{dk_F}| \ge 10^{-1}\zeta^7d^3|B^{dk_B}| \ge 10^{-1}\zeta^7d^3 > d$$

(LPP: $\zeta \succ \eta = d^{-1}$), and

$$|T_{A^f,j,1}|, |U_{A^f,j,1}| \le 2(|W_G| + |Z|) + |B^{k_B}| + |C^{k_C}| <$$
$$< (2(\zeta^{-1} + 3\zeta^{-6}d^{-3}) + 2\zeta^{-6}d^{-4})|G^{k_G}| < 3\zeta^{-1}|G^{k_G}| \le 30\zeta^{-2}|G| < d|A|$$

(LPP: $\zeta \succ \eta = d^{-1}$).

Assume that one of $T_{A^f,j,1}$, $U_{A^f,j,1}$ belongs to $\langle G\rangle \subseteq G(i)$. Then one of B^{k_B}, C^{k_C} is conjugate in rank i to a power of G. However, by Lemmas 6, 7,

$$|B^{k_B}|, |C^{k_C}| \le \zeta^{-6}d^{-4}|G^{k_G}| \le 10\zeta^{-7}d^{-4}|G| < |G|$$

(LPP: $\zeta \succ \eta = d^{-1}$), whence $|B|, |C| < |G|$ which is a contradiction to Lemma 3.

Now we let $z^* = 2$. It follows from definitions that, in the foregoing notation, we can assume that

$$A \equiv H, \quad T_{A^f,j,2} \overset{i}{=} W_H^{-1} W_G G^{k_G} W_G^{-1} W_H, \quad U_{A^f,j,2} \overset{i}{=} W_H^{-1} Z C^{k_C} Z^{-1} W_H,$$

and $f = f(A^f, j, 2)$ is k_H. Hence, in view of Lemmas 6, 7, 8, we have

$$0 < |f| \le 100\zeta^{-1},$$
$$|A| \ge 10^{-2}\zeta^2 |G^{dk_G}| \ge 10^{-2}\zeta^3 d |F^{dk_F}| \ge 10^{-2}\zeta^3 d^2 > d$$

(LPP: $\zeta \succ \eta = d^{-1}$) and

$$\begin{aligned} |T_{A^f,j,2}|, |U_{A^f,j,2}| &\le 2(|W_H| + |W_G| + |Z|) + |G^{k_G}| + |C^{k_C}| < \\ &< (2(2\zeta^{-1} + \zeta^{-2}d^{-1} + 3\zeta^{-7}d^{-4}) + \zeta^{-1}d^{-1} + \zeta^{-7}d^{-5})|H^{k_H}| < \\ &< 5\zeta^{-1}|H^{k_H}| \le 500\zeta^{-2}|H| < d|A| \end{aligned}$$

(LPP: $\zeta \succ \eta = d^{-1}$), as required.

Assume that one of $T_{A^f,j,2}$, $U_{A^f,j,2}$ belongs to $\langle H \rangle \subseteq G(i)$. Then one of G^{k_G}, C^{k_C} is conjugate in rank i to a power of H. However, we saw above that $|B|, |C| < |G|$ and it follows from Lemma 8 that

$$|G| \le \zeta^{-1}d^{-1} \cdot 100\zeta^{-1}|H| < |H|$$

(LPP: $\zeta \succ \eta = d^{-1}$). Therefore, $|G|, |C| < |H|$ and, as before, we have a contradiction to Lemma 3. Lemma 9 is proved. $\square$

Lemma 10. *Suppose that* (X_1, Y_1) *and* (X_2, Y_2) *are two pairs of words such that* $(X_1^d Y_1^d)^d X_1^d$ *is conjugate in rank* i *to* $(X_2^d Y_2^d)^d X_2^d$ *and* $[X_1, Y_1] \overset{i}{\neq} 1$, $[X_2, Y_2] \overset{i}{\neq} 1$. *Then the pairs* (X_1, Y_1) *and* (X_2, Y_2) *are conjugate in rank* i.

Proof. Without loss of generality we can assume that

$$X_1 \equiv B_1^{k_{B_1}}, \quad X_2 \equiv B_2^{k_{B_2}}, \quad Y_1 \equiv Z_1 C_1^{k_{C_1}} Z_1^{-1}, \quad Y_2 \equiv Z_2 C_2^{k_{C_2}} Z_2^{-1},$$
$$X_1^d Y_1^d \equiv W_{D_1} D_1^{k_{D_1}} W_{D_1}^{-1}, \quad X_2^d Y_2^d \equiv W_{D_2} D_2^{k_{D_2}} W_{D_2}^{-1},$$

where B_1, B_2, C_1, C_2, D_1, D_2 are words simple in rank i or periods of rank $\le i$, the words Z_1, Z_2, W_{D_1}, W_{D_2} have the minimal lengths among all words satisfying the corresponding equalities, and if $A_1 \in \{B_1, B_2, C_1, C_2, D_1, D_2\}$ is conjugate in rank i to $A_2^{\pm 1}$, where $A_2 \in \{B_1, B_2, C_1, C_2, D_1, D_2\}$, then $A_1 \equiv A_2$.

Consider a reduced annular diagram Δ of rank i for conjugacy of the words $W_{D_1} D_1^{dk_{D_1}} W_{D_1}^{-1} B_1^{dk_{B_1}}$ and $W_{D_2} D_2^{dk_{D_2}} W_{D_2}^{-1} B_2^{dk_{B_2}}$. Denote two cyclic sections of the boundary $\partial\Delta$ of Δ by $p_1 q_1$ and $(p_2 q_2)^{-1}$, where

$$\varphi(p_1) \equiv D^{dk_{D_1}}, \quad \varphi(q_1) \equiv W_{D_1}^{-1} B_1^{dk_{B_1}} W_{D_1},$$
$$\varphi(p_2) \equiv D^{dk_{D_2}}, \quad \varphi(q_2) \equiv W_{D_2}^{-1} B_2^{dk_{B_2}} W_{D_2}.$$

It follows from Lemma 6 that

$$|W_{D_1}^{-1} B_1^{dk_{B_1}} W_{D_1}| < 11\zeta^{-2}|D_1^{k_{D_1}}| \le 11\zeta^{-2}d^{-1}|D_1^{dk_{D_1}}| < \zeta^3 |D_1^{dk_{D_1}}|$$

(LPP: $\zeta \succ \eta = d^{-1}$). Analogously, $|W_{D_2}^{-1} B_2^{dk_{B_2}} W_{D_2}| < \zeta^3 |D_2^{dk_{D_2}}|$. Hence,

$$|q_1| < \zeta^3 |p_1|, \quad |q_2| < \zeta^3 |p_2|. \tag{28}$$

Assume that $|q_1| \geq \zeta|p_2|$. Then it follows from (28) that

$$|p_2q_2| < (1+\zeta^3)|p_2| \leq \zeta^{-1}(1+\zeta^3)|q_1| < \zeta^2(1+\zeta^3)|p_1| < \zeta|p_1|.$$

Hence, $|p_2q_2| < \zeta|p_1|$ and, in view of (28), Δ is an F-map whose existence contradicts Lemma 1 and Lemmas 24.7, 25.10 [16].

Therefore, we can assume that $|q_1| < \zeta|p_2|$ and, similarly, $|q_2| < \zeta|p_1|$. Now we can see that Δ is an I-map. It follows from Lemmas 4 and 25.10 [16] that $D_1 \equiv D_2 \equiv D$ and the sections p_1, p_2 are D-compatible. By Lemma 6, $|k_{D_1}| \leq 100\zeta^{-1}$. Hence, using estimate (28), we get

$$|q_1| < \zeta^3|p_1| = \zeta^3|D_1^{dk_{D_1}}| \leq 100\zeta^2|D_1^d| < \zeta|D_1^d| = \zeta|D^d|.$$

Analogously, $|q_2| < \zeta|D^d|$.

If $k_{D_1} \neq k_{D_2}$, then cutting Δ along a simple path, that makes p_1 and p_2 D-compatible, we could turn Δ into an F-map whose existence contradicts Lemma 1 and Lemmas 24.7, 25.10 [16]. Hence, it is shown that $k_{D_1} = k_{D_2} = k$. Cutting Δ along a simple path, that makes p_1 and p_2 D-compatible, we can see that

$$W_{D_2}D^{\ell_D}W_{D_1}^{-1}B_1^{dk_{B_1}}W_{D_1}D^{-\ell_D}W_{D_2}^{-1} \overset{i}{=} B_2^{dk_{B_2}}$$

for some integer ℓ_D. By Lemma 3, B_1 and $(B_2)^{\pm 1}$ are conjugate in rank i. Hence, $B_1 \equiv B_2 \equiv B$. It also follows from Lemma 3 that $k_{B_1} = k_{B_2}$ and $W_{D_2}D^{\ell_D}W_{D_1}^{-1} \overset{i}{=} B^{\ell_B}$ for some integer ℓ_B. This implies that $W_{D_1} \overset{i}{=} B^{-\ell_B}W_{D_2}D^{\ell_D}$ and so

$$X_1^dY_1^d \overset{i}{=} W_{D_1}D^kW_{D_1}^{-1} \overset{i}{=} B^{-\ell_B}W_{D_2}D^{\ell_D}D^kD^{-\ell_D}W_{D_2}^{-1}B^{\ell_B} \overset{i}{=}$$
$$\overset{i}{=} B^{-\ell_B}X_2^dY_2^dB^{\ell_B} \overset{i}{=} X_2^dB^{-\ell_B}Y_2^dB^{\ell_B}.$$

Since $X_1 \equiv X_2 \equiv B^{k_{B_1}}$, we obtain that $Y_1^d \overset{i}{=} B^{-\ell_B}Y_2^dB^{\ell_B}$. By Lemma 2, $Y_1 \overset{i}{=} B^{-\ell_B}Y_2B^{\ell_B}$ and we see that the pair (X_2, Y_2) is conjugate in rank i to (X_1, Y_1) by B^{ℓ_B}. Lemma 10 is proved. □

Lemma 11. *Suppose that* (X_1, Y_1) *and* (X_2, Y_2) *are two pairs of words such that* $(X_1^dY_1^d)^dX_1^d$ *is conjugate in rank* i *to* $((X_2^dY_2^d)^dX_2^d)^{-1}$ *and* $[X_1, Y_1] \overset{i}{\neq} 1$, $[X_2, Y_2] \overset{i}{\neq} 1$. *Then the pairs* (X_1, Y_1) *and* (X_2^{-1}, Y_2^{-1}) *are conjugate in rank* i.

Proof. Observe that $((X_2^dY_2^d)^dX_2^d)^{-1} \overset{0}{=} ((X_2^{-1})^d(Y_2^{-1})^d)^d(X_2^{-1})^d$. Therefore, if $(X_1^dY_1^d)^dX_1^d$ is conjugate in rank i to $((X_2^dY_2^d)^dX_2^d)^{-1}$, then $(X_1^dY_1^d)^dX_1^d$ is conjugate in rank i to $((X_2^{-1})^d(Y_2^{-1})^d)^d(X_2^{-1})^d$. Hence, our claim follows from Lemma 10. □

Lemma 12. *Suppose that* (X_1, Y_1) *and* (X_2, Y_2) *are two pairs of words such that* $v_1(X_1, Y_1)$ *is conjugate in rank* i *to* $v_1(X_2, Y_2)$ *and* $[X_1, Y_1] \overset{i}{\neq} 1$, $[X_2, Y_2] \overset{i}{\neq} 1$. *Then the pairs* (X_1, Y_1) *and* (X_2, Y_2) *are conjugate in rank* i.

Proof. Conjugating the pairs (X_1, Y_1), (X_2, Y_2) in rank i if necessary, we can assume that

$$X_1 \equiv B_1^{k_{B_1}}, \quad Y_1 \equiv Z_1C_1^{k_{C_1}}Z_1^{-1}, \quad X_2 \equiv B_2^{k_{B_2}}, \quad Y_2 \equiv Z_2C_2^{k_{C_2}}Z_2^{-1},$$

where each of B_1, B_2, C_1, C_2 is either simple in rank i or a period of some rank $\leq i$ and, when $B_1^{k_{B_1}}$, $B_2^{k_{B_2}}$, $C_1^{k_{C_1}}$, $C_2^{k_{C_2}}$ are fixed, the words Z_1, Z_2 are picked to have minimal length. Furthermore, consider the following equalities

$$X_1^dY_1^d \overset{i}{=} W_{D_1}D_1^{k_{D_1}}W_{D_1}^{-1}, \quad X_2^dY_2^d \overset{i}{=} W_{D_2}D_2^{k_{D_2}}W_{D_2}^{-1},$$
$$(X_1^dY_1^d)^dX_1^d \overset{i}{=} W_{E_1}E_1^{k_{E_1}}W_{E_1}^{-1}, \quad (X_2^dY_2^d)^dX_2^d \overset{i}{=} W_{E_2}E_2^{k_{E_2}}W_{E_2}^{-1},$$
$$[((X_1^dY_1^d)^dX_1^d)^d, X_1^d] \overset{i}{=} W_{F_1}F_1^{k_{F_1}}W_{F_1}^{-1}, \quad [((X_2^dY_2^d)^dX_2^d)^d, X_2^d] \overset{i}{=} W_{F_2}F_2^{k_{F_2}}W_{F_2}^{-1},$$

where each of D_1, E_1, F_1, D_2, E_2 F_2 is either a simple in rank i word or a period of some rank $\leq i$ and the conjugating words W_{D_1}, W_{E_1}, W_{F_1}, W_{D_2}, W_{E_2}, W_{F_2} are picked (when D_1, E_1, F_1, D_2, E_2 F_2 are fixed) to have minimal lengths.

We can also assume that if $A_1 \in \{B_1, C_1, D_1, E_1, F_1, B_2, C_2, D_2, E_2, F_2\}$ is conjugate in rank i to $A_2^{\pm 1}$, where $A_2 \in \{B_1, C_1, D_1, E_1, F_1, B_2, C_2, D_2, E_2, F_2\}$, then $A_1 \equiv A_2$.

Consider a reduced annular diagram Δ of rank i for conjugacy of the words $W_{F_1}F_1^{dk_{F_1}}W_{F_1}^{-1}Z_1C_1^{k_{C_1}}Z_1^{-1}$ and $W_{F_2}F_2^{dk_{F_2}}W_{F_2}^{-1}Z_2C_2^{k_{C_2}}Z_2^{-1}$. Denote two cyclic sections of the boundary $\partial\Delta$ of Δ by p_1q_1 and $(p_2q_2)^{-1}$, where

$$\varphi(p_1) \equiv F_1^{dk_{F_1}}, \quad \varphi(q_1) \equiv W_{F_1}^{-1}Z_1C_1^{k_{C_1}}Z_1^{-1}W_{F_1},$$
$$\varphi(p_2) \equiv F_2^{dk_{F_2}}, \quad \varphi(q_2) \equiv W_{F_2}^{-1}Z_2C_2^{k_{C_2}}Z_2^{-1}W_{F_2}.$$

It follows from Lemma 6 that

$$|W_{F_1}^{-1}Z_1C_1^{k_{C_1}}Z_1^{-1}W_{F_1}| < (4\zeta^{-1} + 7\zeta^{-5}d^{-2})|F_1^{k_{F_1}}| \leq$$
$$\leq (4\zeta^{-1} + 7\zeta^{-5}d^{-2})d^{-1}|F_1^{dk_{F_1}}| < \zeta^3|F_1^{dk_{F_1}}|$$

(LPP: $\zeta \succ \eta = d^{-1}$). Analogously, $|W_{F_2}^{-1}Z_2C_2^{k_{C_2}}Z_2^{-1}W_{F_2}| < \zeta^3|F_2^{dk_{F_2}}|$. Hence,

$$|q_1| < \zeta^3|p_1|, \quad |q_2| < \zeta^3|p_2|. \tag{29}$$

Assume that $|q_1| \geq \zeta|p_2|$. Then it follows from (29) that

$$|p_2q_2| < (1 + \zeta^3)|p_2| \leq \zeta^{-1}(1 + \zeta^3)|q_1| < \zeta^2(1 + \zeta^3)|p_1| < \zeta|p_1|.$$

Hence, $|p_2q_2| < \zeta|p_1|$ and, in view of (29), Δ is an F-map whose existence contradicts Lemma 1 and Lemmas 24.7, 25.10 [16].

Therefore, we can assume that $|q_1| < \zeta|p_2|$ and, similarly, $|q_2| < \zeta|p_1|$. Now we can see that Δ is an I-map. By Lemmas 4 and 25.10 [16], $F_1 \equiv F_2 \equiv F$ and sections p_1 and p_2 are F-compatible. By Lemma 6, $|k_{F_1}| \leq 100\zeta^{-1}$. Hence, using estimate (29), we have

$$|q_1| < \zeta^3|p_1| = \zeta^3|F_1^{dk_{F_1}}| \leq 100\zeta^2|F_1^d| < \zeta|F_1^d| = \zeta|F^d|.$$

Analogously, $|q_2| < \zeta|F^d|$.

If $k_{F_1} \neq k_{F_2}$, then, cutting Δ along a simple path, that makes p_1 and p_2 F-compatible, we could turn Δ into an F-map whose existence contradicts Lemma 1 and Lemmas 24.7, 25.10 [16]. Hence, $k_{F_1} = k_{F_2}$ and, cutting Δ along a simple path, that makes p_1 and p_2 F-compatible, we can see that Y_1 and Y_2 are conjugate in rank i.

Since $k_{F_1} = k_{F_2}$, it follows from definitions that the word $[W_{E_1}E_1^{dk_{E_1}}W_{E_1}^{-1}, B_1^{dk_{B_1}}]$ is conjugate in rank i to $[W_{E_2}E_2^{dk_{E_2}}W_{E_2}^{-1}, B_2^{dk_{B_2}}]$. Let Δ be a reduced annular diagram of rank i for conjugacy of these two words. Denote two cyclic sections of the boundary $\partial\Delta$ of Δ by $p_1q_1p_2q_2$ and $(p_3q_3p_4q_4)^{-1}$, where

$$\varphi(p_1) \equiv \varphi(p_2)^{-1} \equiv E_1^{dk_{E_1}}, \quad \varphi(q_1) \equiv \varphi(q_2)^{-1} \equiv W_{E_1}^{-1} B_1^{dk_{B_1}} W_{E_1}$$
$$\varphi(p_3) \equiv \varphi(p_4)^{-1} \equiv E_2^{dk_{E_2}}, \quad \varphi(q_3) \equiv \varphi(q_4)^{-1} \equiv W_{E_2}^{-1} B_2^{dk_{B_2}} W_{E_2}.$$

It follows from Lemma 6 that

$$|W_{E_1}^{-1} B_1^{dk_{B_1}} W_{E_1}| < (4\zeta^{-2} + \zeta^{-4}d^{-1})|E_1^{k_{E_1}}| \le$$
$$\le (4\zeta^{-2} + \zeta^{-4}d^{-1})d^{-1}|E_1^{dk_{E_1}}| < \zeta^3|E_1^{dk_{E_1}}|$$

(LPP: $\zeta \succ \eta = d^{-1}$). Therefore,

$$|q_1|, |q_2| < \zeta^3|p_1| \quad \text{and} \quad |q_1|, |q_2| < \zeta^3|p_2|. \tag{30}$$

Similarly,

$$|q_3|, |q_4| < \zeta^3|p_3| \quad \text{and} \quad |q_3|, |q_4| < \zeta^3|p_4|. \tag{31}$$

Assume that $|q_1| \ge \zeta|p_3|$. Then, by (30)–(31), we have

$$|p_3q_3p_4q_4| < 2(1+\zeta^3)|p_3| \le 2\zeta^{-1}(1+\zeta^3)|q_1| < 2\zeta^2(1+\zeta^3)|p_1| < \zeta|p_1|.$$

In view of estimates (30)–(31), we can turn Δ into an E-map Δ' by pasting together q_1 and q_2. It follows from Lemmas 24.6, 25.10 [16] that the images of p_1 and p_2 in Δ' are E_1-compatible. This implies that $k_{F_2} = 0$, contrary to Lemma 6.

Therefore, we can assume that $|q_1| < \zeta|p_3|$ and, similarly, $|q_3| < \zeta|p_1|$. Now we can see that Δ is an I-map. If p_1 and p_2 are E_1-compatible in Δ, then $k_{F_2} = 0$, contrary to Lemma 6. Hence, p_1 and p_2 may not be E_1-compatible in Δ. Similarly, p_3 and p_4 are not E_2-compatible in Δ. Therefore, it follows from Lemmas 4 and 25.10 [16] that $E_1 \equiv E_2 \equiv E$ and either p_1 is E-compatible with p_3^{-1} and p_2 is E-compatible with p_4^{-1} or p_1 is E-compatible with p_4^{-1} and p_2 is E-compatible with p_3^{-1}. Let t_1 and t_2 be simple disjoint paths in Δ that make corresponding pairs of paths p_1, p_2, p_3^{-1}, p_4^{-1} E-compatible. Let us cut Δ along t_1 and t_2 and then paste the two resulting diagrams along the images of q_3 and q_4^{-1} (recall that $\varphi(q_3) \equiv \varphi(q_4)^{-1}$). Let Δ_0 denote the simply connected diagram of rank i thus obtained from Δ. Observe that

$$\varphi(\partial\Delta_0) \overset{i}{=} E_1^{\ell_E} W_{E_1}^{-1} B_1^{dk_{B_1}} W_{E_1} E_1^{-\ell_E} W_{E_1}^{-1} B_1^{-dk_{B_1}} W_{E_1} \overset{i}{=} 1, \tag{32}$$

where either $\ell_E = d(k_{E_1} - k_{E_2})$ in the case when p_1 is E_1-compatible in Δ with p_3^{-1} and p_2 is E_1-compatible with p_4^{-1} or $\ell_E = d(k_{E_1} + k_{E_2})$ in the case when p_1 is E_1-compatible in Δ with p_4^{-1} and p_2 is E_1-compatible with p_3^{-1}. If $k_{E_1} \ne \pm k_{E_2}$ then it follows from Lemma 3, equality (32) and definitions that $B_1 \equiv E_1$. On the other hand, it follows from Lemma 6 that

$$|B_1| \le \zeta^{-4}d^{-2}|E_1^{k_{E_1}}| < 100\zeta^{-5}d^{-2}|E_1| < |E_1|$$

(LPP: $\zeta \succ \eta = d^{-1}$). This contradiction shows that $k_{E_1} = \pm k_{E_2}$ and so $E_1^{k_{E_1}} \equiv E_2^{\pm k_{E_2}}$. By definitions, this means that the word $(X_1^dY_1^d)^dX_1^d$ is conjugate in rank i to $((X_2^dY_2^d)^dX_2^d)^{\pm 1}$.

Assume that $(X_1^dY_1^d)^dX_1^d$ is conjugate in rank i to $((X_2^dY_2^d)^dX_2^d)^{-1}$. Then, by Lemma 11, Y_1 is conjugate in rank i to Y_2^{-1}. On the other hand, as we saw above, Y_1 is conjugate in rank i to Y_2. Hence, Y_2 is conjugate in rank i to Y_2^{-1}. This, however, by Lemmas 3 and 2, implies that $Y_2 \overset{i}{=} 1$. This contradiction to $[X_1, Y_1] \overset{i}{\ne} 1$ proves that $(X_1^dY_1^d)^dX_1^d$ is conjugate in rank i to $(X_2^dY_2^d)^dX_2^d$. Now a reference to Lemma 10 completes the proof of Lemma 12. ☐

4. PROOF OF THEOREM

Our Theorem is immediate from the following below Lemmas 13–14.

Lemma 13. *The group* $G(\infty)$*, defined by presentation* (7)*, is naturally isomorphic to the free group* $F(\mathcal{A})/W_{1,2}(F(\mathcal{A}))$ *of the variety* $\mathfrak{M}$ *in the alphabet* $\mathcal{A}$*.*

Proof. It follows from the definition of defining words of the group $G(\infty)$ that each of them is in $W_{1,2}(F(\mathcal{A}))$ and so there is a natural epimorphism

$$G(\infty) \to F(\mathcal{A})/W_{1,2}(F(\mathcal{A})).$$

Suppose that $\widetilde{X}$, $\widetilde{Y}$ are some words in $\mathcal{A}^{\pm 1}$ and

$$w_{z^*}(\widetilde{X}, \widetilde{Y}) \neq 1 \tag{33}$$

in the group $G(\infty)$, where $z^* \in \{1, 2\}$.

Let A be a period of some rank such that A^f for some f is conjugate in $G(\infty)$ to $v_{z^*}(\widetilde{X}, \widetilde{Y})$. (The existence of such an A follows from definitions and Lemma 3; see also Lemma 18.1 [16].) Note that, in view of (33), $[\widetilde{X}, \widetilde{Y}] \neq 1$ in $G(\infty)$. Hence, by Lemmas 6, 7, 8, we can replace the pair $(\widetilde{X}, \widetilde{Y})$ by a conjugate in the group $G(\infty)$ pair (X, Y) such that $X \equiv B^{k_B}$, $Y \equiv ZC^{k_C}Z^{-1}$, and $v_{z^*}(X, Y) = W_A A^f W_A^{-1}$ in $G(\infty)$, where B, C are some periods, $|f| > 0$ and

$$|X^d| + |Y^d| = |B^{dk_B}| + |C^{dk_C}| + 2|Z| < 8\zeta^{-5}d^{-2}|F^{k_F}| \leq 8\zeta^{-6}d^{-3}|A^f|.$$

Hence, the length $|v_{z^*}(X, Y)|$, which is either $|[((X^dY^d)^dX^d)^d, X^d]^dY|$ if $z^* = 1$ or $|[([((X^dY^d)^dX^d)^d, X^d]^dY)^d, X^d]|$ if $z^* = 2$, can be estimated as follows

$$\begin{aligned}|v_{z^*}(X, Y)| &\leq 2d(d(2d(d(|X^d| + |Y^d|) + |X^d|) + 2|X^d|) + |Y|) + 2|X^d| < \\ &< 5d^4(|X^d| + |Y^d|) < 40d\zeta^{-6}|A^f| < 10^4d\zeta^{-7}|A|\end{aligned}$$

for $0 < |f| \leq 100\zeta^{-1}$ by Lemmas 7, 8. Consider a reduced annular diagram Δ of some rank i' for conjugacy of $v_{z^*}(X, Y)$ and A^f. By Lemmas 1 and 22.1 [16], Δ can be cut into a simply connected diagram Δ_1 along a simple path t which connects points on distinct components of $\partial\Delta$ with $|t| < \gamma|\partial\Delta|$. Therefore,

$$|\partial\Delta_1| < (1 + 2\gamma)|\partial\Delta| < (1 + 2\gamma)(10^4d\zeta^{-7} + 100\zeta^{-1})|A| < \tfrac{1}{2}n|A|$$

(LPP: $\gamma \succ \zeta \succ \eta = d^{-1} \succ \iota = n^{-1}$). Then, by Lemmas 1, 20.4 and 23.16 [16] applied to Δ_1, the diagram Δ_1 contains no 2-cells of rank $\geq |A|$, whence Δ_1, Δ are diagrams of rank $|A| - 1$. Since $A \in \mathcal{X}_{|A|}$, it follows from the construction of defining words of rank $|A|$ that there will be a defining word in $\mathcal{S}_{|A|}$ which guarantees that $w_{z^*}(X, Y) \overset{|A|}{=} 1$. A contradiction to the assumption (33) proves that $G(\infty)$ is in $\mathfrak{M}$ and Lemma 13 is proved. ☐

Lemma 14. *The group* $G(\infty)$*, defined by presentation* (7)*, is not hopfian.*

Proof. By Lemma 13, $G(\infty)$ is the free group of $\mathfrak{M}$ in $\mathcal{A}$ and, therefore, every map $a_1 \to U_1, \dots, a_m \to U_m$, where $U_1, \dots, U_m$ are words in $\mathcal{A}^{\pm 1}$, extends to a homomorphism $G(\infty) \to G(\infty)$.

Consider a homomorphism $\psi_\infty : G(\infty) \to G(\infty)$ defined by $\psi_\infty(a_j) = a_j$ if $j \neq 2$ and $\psi_\infty(a_2) = v_1(a_1, a_2)$. Observe that the relation $w_2(a_1, a_2) = 1$ in $G(\infty)$ and the definition (3) of the word $w_2(x,y)$ ensure that $a_2 \in \langle a_1, v_1(a_1,a_2)\rangle \subseteq G(\infty)$. Hence, ψ_∞ is an epimorphism. Assume that ψ_∞ is an automorphism. Then it follows from the relation $w_1(a_1,a_2)=1$ in $G(\infty)$ that the word

$$U \equiv a_1^{\varepsilon_1} a_2^{n} a_1^{\varepsilon_2} a_2^{n+2} \dots a_1^{\varepsilon_{h/2-2}} a_2^{n+h-6} a_1^{\varepsilon_{h/2-1}} a_2^{n+h-4} a_1^{\varepsilon_{h/2}} a_2^{(n+h-2)+h/2} \\ a_1^{\varepsilon_1} a_2^{-(n+1)} a_1^{\varepsilon_2} a_2^{-(n+3)} \dots a_1^{\varepsilon_{h/2-1}} a_2^{-(n+h-3)} a_1^{\varepsilon_{h/2}} a_2^{-(n+h-1)}$$

is equal to 1 in $G(\infty)$. Note that U is cyclically reduced and $|U| < (n+h)h$. Consequently,

$$|U| < (n+h)h < (1-\alpha)(h-1)nd \tag{34}$$

(LPP: $\alpha \succ \zeta = h^{-1} \succ \eta = d^{-1} \succ \iota = n^{-1}$).

On the other hand, since $U = 1$ in $G(\infty)$ and $U \neq 1$ in the free group $F(\mathcal{A})$, it follows from Lemmas 1 and 23.16 [16] that

$$|U| > (1-\alpha)|\partial\Pi|, \tag{35}$$

where Π is a 2-cell of positive rank. Furthermore, it follows from Lemmas 9 and 20.4 [16] (together with condition B, see Sect. 20.4 [16]) that

$$|\partial\Pi| > (h-1)nr(\Pi) > (h-1)nd \tag{36}$$

for an arbitrary 2-cell Π of rank $r(\Pi) \geq 1$. However, inequalities (35)–(36) contradict (34). This contradiction shows that $U \neq 1$ in $G(\infty)$. Thus, U is in the kernel of ψ_∞ and $G(\infty)$ is not hopfian, as required. $\square$

In conclusion, we remark that, for every $i \geq 0$, the group $G(i)$, given by presentation (6), is finitely presented (this follows from definitions and Lemmas 6–9) and satisfies a linear isoperimetric inequality (this can be proved similar to Lemma 21.1 [5]). Therefore, $G(i)$ is a torsion-free Gromov hyperbolic group (see [3]) and so, by Sela's results [18], $G(i)$ is a hopfian group. Therefore, the non-hopfian group $G(\infty)$, given by presentation (7), is a limit of hopfian groups $G(i)$, $i = 0, 1, \dots$.

References

[1] S.I. Adian, *The Burnside problem and identities in groups*, Nauka, Moscow, 1975; English translation: Springer-Verlag, 1979.

[2] G. Baumslag, *Wreath products and extensions*, Math. Z. **81**(1963), 286–299.

[3] M. Gromov, *Hyperbolic groups*, Essays in Group Theory, M.S.R.I. Publ. 8, Springer, 1987, 75–263.

[4] Ph. Hall and G. Higman, *On the p-length of p-soluble groups and reduction theorems for Burnside's problem*, Proc. London Math. Soc. **6**(1956), 1–42.

[5] S.V. Ivanov, *The free Burnside groups of sufficiently large exponents*, Internat. J. Algebra Comp. **4**(1994), 1–308.

[6] S.V. Ivanov, *On the Burnside problem for groups of even exponent*, Documenta Mathematica, Extra Volume ICM-98 **II**(1998), 67–76.

[7] S.V. Ivanov and A.Yu. Ol'shanskii, *Some applications of graded diagrams in combinatorial group theory*, London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser., vol.160(1991), Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge and New York, 1991, 258–308.

[8] A.I. Kostrikin, *On a problem of Burnside*, Math. USSR Izvestiya **23**(1959), 3–34.

[9] A.I. Kostrikin, *Around Burnside*, Nauka, Moscow, 1986; English translation: Springer-Verlag, 1990.

[10] *Kourovka Notebook: Unsolved problems in group theory*, 12th Ed., Novosibirsk, 1992.

[11] I.G. Lysenok, *Infinite Burnside groups of even period*, Math. Ross. Izvestiya **60**(1996), 3–224.

[12] H. Neumann, *Varieties of groups*, Springer-Verlag, 1967.

[13] P.S. Novikov and S.I. Adian, *On infinite periodic groups, I, II, III*, Math. USSR Izvestiya **32**(1968), 212–244, 251–524, 709–731.

[14] A.Yu. Ol'shanskii, *On the Novikov-Adian theorem*, Mat. Sbornik **118**(1982), 203–235.

[15] A.Yu. Ol'shanskii, *Varieties in which all finite groups are abelian*, Mat. Sbornik **126**(1985), 59–82.

[16] A.Yu. Ol'shanskii, *Geometry of defining relations in groups*, Nauka, Moscow, 1989; English translation: Math. and Its Appl., Soviet series **70**, Kluwer Acad. Publ., 1991.

[17] A.M. Storozhev, *On abelian subgroups of relatively free groups*, Comm. Algebra **22**(1994), 2677–2701.

[18] Z. Sela, *Endomorphisms of hyperbolic groups. I. The Hopf property*, Topology **38**(1999), 301–321.

[19] E.I. Zelmanov, *Solution of the restricted Burnside problem for groups of odd exponent*, Math. USSR Izvestiya **36**(1991), 41–60.

[20] E.I. Zelmanov, *A solution of the restricted Burnside problem for 2-groups*, Mat. Sbornik **72**(1992), 543–565.

Department of Mathematics, University of Illinois, Urbana, IL 61801, U.S.A.
E-mail address: `ivanov@math.uiuc.edu`

Australian Mathematics Trust, University of Canberra, Belconnen, ACT 2601, Australia
E-mail address: `andreis@amt.canberra.edu.au`